

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

Becker, Kurig, Straus
Bavariastrasse 7
DE-80336 MÜNCHEN
Germany

BECKER KURIG STRAUS
BAVARIASTRASSE 80336 MÜNCHEN

17. Mai 2004

WV: / LR:

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

13 -05- 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference 51029WO	REPLY DUE within 60 days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/IB 2002/002264	International filing date (day/month/year) 19-06-2002
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F 17/30, H04Q 7/38	
Applicant Nokia Corporation et al → B4	

1. The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:
 is is not
 considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This first (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 Box No. I Basis of the opinion
 Box No. II Priority
 Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.
When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).
How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3.
 For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.
Also For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.
 For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.
 For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
 If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 2004-10-19

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE Patent- och registreringsverket Box 5055 S-102 42 STOCKHOLM Facsimile No. 46 8 667 72 88	Authorized officer Oskar Pihlgren /LR Telephone No. 46 8 782 25 00
--	---

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002264

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:

international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
 publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
 international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of (*replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."*):

the international application as originally filed/furnished
 the description:

pages 1 - 13 as originally filed/furnished
 pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
 pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

the claims:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
 pages 1 - 3 as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
 pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

the drawings:

pages 1 - 2 as originally filed/furnished
 pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
 pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

the description, pages _____
 the claims, Nos. _____
 the drawings, sheets/figs _____
 the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
 any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

the description, pages _____
 the claims, Nos. _____
 the drawings, sheets/figs _____
 the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
 any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002264

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application
 claims Nos. 9, 12, 14, 23, 25

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 9, 12, 14, 23, 25

the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in the Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002264

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
-----------	--

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-4, 6, 7, 17-21</u>
	Claims	_____
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>1-8, 10, 11, 13, 15-22, 24</u>
	Claims	_____
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	_____
	Claims	_____

2. Citations and explanations:

Cited documents

D1: Look Ma', My homepage is Mobile! Roger Kehr and Andreas Zeidler, Presented as a short paper at HUC'2k, September 25-27, 2000, HP Labs, Bristol, UK. Published in Journal of Personal Technologies, Vol 4, 2000, Springer.

D2: US 5956487 A

Statement

D1, which is the prior-art-cited-document most closely related to the present invention, discloses a system where a mobile device is used as an information service provider. Thereby it is possible for a client somewhere on the Web to obtain information about the current context a mobile device is in. A web server with a homepage is running inside a mobile device, and the mobile web server can be accessed by mobile or static clients. This web server is used to enhance Web pages dynamically with context related information for the mobile device and brings the virtual presence of a user near the physical presence. In D1, page 3, is illustrated an example of what a context related mobile homepage template can look like.

With reference to what is prior known by D1 as stated above, what is claimed in claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 17-21 lacks novelty.

What is claimed in claims 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 22 and 24 are only minor accessory technical details which are considered to be obvious to a person skilled in the art and which in themselves are considered not to involve an inventive step. Furthermore, none of these details contribute to any unexpected technical effects which cannot be anticipated by a

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB 2002/002264

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: Box V

person skilled in the art. In addition what is stated in claims 5, 8, 10 and 11 is considered to lack clarity and conciseness within the meaning of Article 6, PCT (see also Rule 6.3(a) according to which the definition of the matter for which protection is sought shall be in terms of the technical features of the invention).